



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,555	03/06/2006	Mark Ibberson	ARS-109	4701
23557	7590	06/27/2008	EXAMINER	
SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			HISSONG, BRUCE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/537,555	IBBERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bruce D. Hissong, Ph.D.	1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 50-70 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 50-70 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>sequence comparison</u> .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

A. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 50-51 and 55 drawn to a composition of matter comprising an isolated polypeptide.

Group II, claim(s) 50 and 52-55, drawn to a composition of matter comprising a ligand to the isolated polypeptide of group I.

Group III, claim(s) 50 and 55 drawn to a composition of matter comprising a peptide mimetic of the polypeptide of group I.

Group IV, claim(s) 50 and 55 drawn to a composition of matter comprising an isolated nucleic acid encoding an isolated polypeptide of group I.

Group V, claim(s) 50, drawn to a composition of matter comprising a transgenic animal cell or transgenic non-human organism.

Group VI, claim(s) 50 and 56 drawn to a composition of matter comprising a compound that enhances the expression of a polypeptide of group I.

Group VII, claim(s) 50, drawn to a composition of matter comprising a compound that reduces expression of a polypeptide of group I.

Group VIII, claim(s) 57-68, drawn to methods of using a composition of matter.

Group IX, claim(s) 69-70, drawn to methods of secreting a polypeptide.

B. The inventions listed as Groups I-IX do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The first claimed invention fails to share a special technical feature with the other claims. PCT rules define a special technical feature as a feature that makes a contribution over the art. Claim 50 has no such special technical feature in view of Mintz et al (US 20070083334). Claim 50 recites an isolated polypeptide comprising a sequence having at least 80% homology with pIFNHcon (SEQ ID NO: 156) and no more than nine non-conservative mutations in the positions corresponding to Ala10, Gly12, Arg26, Ala31, Lys35, Phe47, Gln55, Glu57, Lys63, and Ile75. Lintz teaches a polypeptide comprising a sequence that is 84.0% homologous to SEQ ID NO: 156 of the instant invention, and further comprises mutations at positions corresponding to Ala10, Arg26, and Glu57 of SEQ ID NO: 156. Although Lintz does not specifically teach that this protein has at least one activity of human IFN-gamma, it would be expected, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that due to the high degree of homology between the protein of Lintz and that of SEQ ID NO: 156 that the protein of Lintz would share at least one IFN-gamma activity. Therefore, because Lintz specifically teaches a protein meeting the limitations of claim 50(a), claim 50 cannot share a special technical feature with the other claims.

C. Additionally, groups I-IX, are subject to further restriction. It is noted that the claims are drawn to examination of at least one of a number of structurally distinct polypeptides, ligands, peptide mimetics, nucleic acids, and transgenic cells/non-human animals.

If Applicants elect groups I-IX, Applicants are required to elect one specific polypeptide, a nucleic acid encoding a specific polypeptide, a ligand for a specifically identified polypeptide, a peptide mimetic of a specific polypeptide, a transgenic cell/non-human animal expressing a specific polypeptide, a compound that enhances expression of a specific polypeptide, OR a compound that reduces expression

of a specific polypeptide. Applicants are required to identity the elected polypeptide or nucleic acid by SEQ ID NO.

If electing group IX, then Applicants are also required to elect a specific use selected from: producing cells capable of expressing a polypeptide and making a polypeptide, preparation of pharmaceutical compositions, treatment of diseases, screening candidate compounds effective to treat a disease, methods for determining activity and/or presence of a polypeptide, or determining the presence or amount of a transcript of a nucleic acid encoding the polypeptide.

In order to be fully responsive, applicant is required to further restrict a specific polypeptide or nucleic acid encoding said polypeptide, or and also a method of use if electing group IX. This is NOT an election of species. The claimed polypeptides and nucleic acids are structurally distinct chemical compounds, and are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such polypeptide is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141. By statute “[i]f two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Commissioner may require the application to be restricted to one of the inventions.” 35 U.S.C. 121. Pursuant to this statute, the rules provide that “[i]f two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in a single application, the examiner in his action shall require the applicant....to elect that invention to which his claim shall be restricted.” 37 CFR 1.142(a). See also 37 CFR 1.141(a). It is noted that search more than one of the claimed patentably polypeptides represents a serious burden for the office.

D. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

E. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product

claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

F. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

G. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce D. Hissong, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571)272-3324. The examiner can normally be reached M-F from 8:30 am - 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Nickol, Ph.D., can be reached at (571) 272-0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Bruce D. Hissong
Art Unit 1646

/Gary B. Nickol /

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1646